

REMARKS

Claims 1, 2, 4 16-20, 22, 26, 27 and 31-34 are currently pending in the subject application and are presently under consideration.

Favorable reconsideration of the subject patent application is respectfully requested in view of the comments herein.

I. Rejection of Claims 1, 2, 16-20, 22, 26, 27 and 31-34 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 1, 2, 16-20, 22, 26, 27 and 31-34 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Hudetz *et al.* (U.S. 5,978,773) in view of Anderson. (U.S. 5,974,396). It is submitted that this rejection be withdrawn for at least the following reasons. Neither Hudetz *et al.* nor Anderson alone or in combination, teach or suggest all aspects recited in the subject claims.

The claimed subject matter relates to *providing demographic information about a consumer to a product manufacturer by utilizing data packet information that transfers the information inquiry to the manufacturer*, or by utilizing information transferred *within the web page request*, or by *employing a Domain Name Service to translate Internet Protocol mapping information*, as respectively recited in independent claims 1, 16 and 22. Neither of the cited references teaches nor suggests such features of the claimed invention.

Hudetz *et al.* relates to a system and method for using identification codes found on ordinary articles of commerce to access remote computers on a network. As conceded by the examiner, Hudetz *et al.* does not teach providing the demographic information of a consumer to the manufacturer *by utilizing the information inquiry or by utilizing information transferred within the web page request* and Anderson is relied upon to overcome such deficiencies. Anderson relates to a method and system for gathering and analyzing consumer *purchasing information* based on product and consumer clustering relationships; and this reference does not make up for the aforementioned deficiencies of Hudetz *et al.*

On page 4 of Final Office Action, it is erroneously contended that Anderson discloses transmitting demographic information about the consumer to the product manufacturer *that transfers the information inquiry to the manufacturer*. At the cited section, Anderson provides a frequent shopper system which includes retail point of sale subsystem and user interface, consumer application subsystem, *consumer purchase repository subsystem* (a relational database) and a market

analysis subsystem. The consumer application sub system provides a mechanism by which consumers provide demographic and other characteristic information as consumer data *to the consumer purchase repository subsystem*. Data is characterized by market analysis subsystem and stored in clusters (product or consumer). Various buying behaviors and patterns are extracted from the cluster data stored in the consumer purchase repository. Consumer and product information retrieved from consumer purchase repository is forwarded to direct marketing subsystem (Col. 6, lines 24-48). Hence, Anderson provides a *consumer purchase repository subsystem* which is readily accessible by retailers to effectively target specific consumers with relevant advertisement and promotional work. Consumer *purchase* repository subsystem has consumer lists of only those consumers who *purchased* a product or products and not those consumers who didn't *purchase* and only made *product enquiry* or *enquired some information about some products*. Also *manufacturer*, as provided by Anderson, *needs to access* the consumer purchase repository subsystem in order to collect consumer and product information. However Anderson does not contemplate providing demographic information about a consumer to a product manufacturer *by utilizing data packet information that transfers the information inquiry to the manufacturer* or *by utilizing information transferred within the web page request*. At page 2 of the Final Office Action, Examiner asserts that Anderson teaches a relational database system of consumer lists who request product information and utilize the consumer request information to target advertisements or promotions to the consumer. The consumer request information and demographic information are sent to the manufacturer so that the manufacturer can target the consumers, and incorporating this Anderson's teaching into Hudetz would provide manufacturers with the capability to market their products and provide incentives to the consumers. Applicants' representative respectfully disagrees and submits that Anderson only provides a *consumer purchase repository subsystem* which gathers consumer list of only those consumers who *purchased a product and not those consumers who only requested product information or made product enquiry and didn't purchase any product*. Nowhere does Anderson teach or suggest providing demographic information about a consumer to a product manufacturer *by utilizing data packet information that transfers the information inquiry to the manufacturer*, or *by utilizing information transferred within the web page request*. In fact, nowhere does Anderson teach or suggest a system of transmitting demographic information about the consumer to the product manufacturer *via employing a Domain Name Service (DNS) to translate Internet Protocol (IP) mapping information transferred by the consumer when requesting a web page* as recited in

independent claim 22. The claimed subject matter facilitates utilizing information about a destination computer inherently included in a request for information by employing cross-application of the DNS system to obtain demographic information associated with *each query*. Hence, the same data packets that *transfer the information request from a user* are utilized to obtain demographic information about the user *i.e. by utilizing data packet information that transfers the information inquiry to the manufacturer*. This mitigates a need for specific user access code by the manufacturers as taught by Anderson in order to collect demographic information about the user and purchasing a product by a user in order to include the user into the list being sent to manufacturers.

From the foregoing it is clear that Hudetz, *et al.* and Anderson either separately or in combination fail to make obvious the subject claims. Hence, it is requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

II Rejection of Claims 4 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claim 4 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Hudetz, *et al.* in view of Anderson as applied in claim 1 above, and further in view of Kaplan (U.S. 5,963,916). This rejection should be withdrawn for at least the following reasons. None of the cited references teach or suggest all limitations recited in the subject claim.

Claim 4 depends from independent claim 1 and, as stated *supra*, neither Hudetz, *et al.* nor Anderson teach or suggest all limitations of claim 1 and Kaplan, *et al.* fails to make up for the aforementioned deficiencies. Independent claim 1 recites a method of conveying a consumer's demographic information to a manufacturer, whereby a scanned bar code of a product can be used to access the manufacturer's website for a product information inquiry and in the process, the demographic information of the consumer can be captured and conveyed to the manufacturer *by utilizing data packet information that transfers the information inquiry to the manufacturer*. Kaplan, *et al.* relates to on-line network web site for interactive preview of a portion of a pre-recorded product by the user but does not teach or suggest providing demographic information about the consumer to the product manufacturer by utilizing data packet information transferred to the manufacturer as a result of the information query, as claimed.

Based on at least the foregoing, none of the cited references teach or suggest all claim limitations. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

The present application is believed to be in condition for allowance in view of the above comments and amendments. A prompt action to such end is earnestly solicited.

In the event any fees are due in connection with this document, the Commissioner is authorized to charge those fees to Deposit Account No. 50-1063 [TELNP333US].

Should the Examiner believe a telephone interview would be helpful to expedite favorable prosecution, the Examiner is invited to contact applicants' undersigned representative at the telephone number below.

Respectfully submitted,
AMIN, TUROCY & CALVIN, LLP

/Himanshu S. Amin/

Himanshu S. Amin
Reg. No. 40,894

AMIN, TUROCY & CALVIN, LLP
24TH Floor, National City Center
1900 E. 9TH Street
Cleveland, Ohio 44114
Telephone (216) 696-8730
Facsimile (216) 696-8731